

The Power of Action: “The” Derivation of the Black Hole Negative Mode

Barak Kol

*Racah Institute of Physics
Hebrew University
Jerusalem 91904, Israel
barak_kol@phys.huji.ac.il*

ABSTRACT: The negative mode of the Schwarzschild black hole is central to Euclidean quantum gravity around hot flat space and for the Gregory-Laflamme black string instability. Numerous gauges were employed in the past to analyze it. Here *the* analytic derivation is found, based on postponing the gauge fixing, on the power of the action and on decoupling of non-dynamic fields. A broad-range generalization to perturbations around arbitrary co-homogeneity 1 geometries is discussed.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Prudence	2
3. The Power of Action	6
3.1 Summary - the negative mode	9
4. The $k = 0$ case	10
4.1 Generalizations	12
A. Previous gauges	13

1. Introduction

The freedom to choose coordinates is a central principle of General Relativity. For a given physical configuration (metric) the theory produces an unprecedented amount of possibilities for its description, namely a large gauge symmetry. This gauge symmetry is a blessing, allowing the use of several coordinate systems each one adapted to highlight a different feature of the metric. At the same time it complicates the theory, making it notoriously difficult to find “the optimal gauge” for a given problem. In this paper we shall solve one outstanding case of this general problem.

The Schwarzschild black hole, a static, spherically symmetric and hence the simplest of all black holes, is known to possess a single negative mode discovered by Gross, Perry and Yaffe [1]. By continuity such a mode will appear also for rotating and charged holes, at least for small angular momentum and charge. While this mode does not represent a physical instability in the time-evolution of the black hole (as seen from its precise definition to be reviewed in the next section) it is responsible for two important features of black hole physics. First, it plays a central role in Euclidean Quantum Gravity around hot flat space [1]. The presence of non-zero temperature is known to be described by a flat space with a periodic Euclidean time coordinate, whose period is related to the inverse temperature. The Euclidean black hole has the same asymptotics, and as such should be included in the path integral as another contributing saddle point. In particular this additional saddle point contributes to corrections of the energy density. As explained in [1] the Euclidean black hole solution is related to a non-perturbative decay of hot flat space (by nucleating a black hole) and hence the correction to the energy density must have an imaginary part. On the other hand that correction is proportional to the square-root of the determinant of fluctuation eigenvalues, and it is the presence of a single negative mode that guarantees

it is indeed imaginary. The second physical property is the Gregory-Laflamme (GL) black string instability [2] – a black-string in 5d was found to be perturbatively unstable to a non-homogeneous fluctuation if it is “thin” enough, namely, as long as its radius divided by its length (the size of the extra dimension) is smaller than some critical value. Essentially, the 4d negative mode is the 5d physical instability mode and its negative eigenvalue is the square of the GL critical value. Accordingly the negative mode plays a central role in the analysis of the black-hole black-string phase transition physics associated with the GL instability [3].

Even though the negative mode and its associated eigenvalue is known already for some 24 years new derivations keep on appearing [1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 5] (see appendix A). The new derivations are motivated by trying to simplify the equations: to decouple the equations for the various components of the metric perturbation tensor, reducing them to a single equation (for a “master field”) and eliminating unphysical singularities.

One wonders why there are so many different derivations for this result, and whether we have seen the end of improvements or are there more surprises waiting for us in this case.

More generally, while a given result may be proven in many ways, some scientists believe that “somewhere” there exists a “book” with “*the* proof”. The author believes that the proof below is “*the* proof” for the case at hand.

2. Prudence

Policy. In order to optimize our choice of gauge-fixing our policy in this paper is to postpone any gauge-fixing as much as possible while collecting all relevant information for this decision. Therefore in this section we shall be prudent to define the perturbation eigenvalue problem and to define the fields, all in a “pre-gauge-fixing” form.

Defining the perturbation eigenvalue problem. We would like to consider perturbations around a static spherical black hole in the background of a flat d -dimensional space-time $\mathbb{R}^{d-1,1}$. In standard Schwarzschild coordinates [10]¹ it is given by

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= -f dt^2 + f^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_{d-2}^2 \\ f(r) &= 1 - \left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{d-3}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where r_0 , the Schwarzschild radius, is the location of the horizon and $d\Omega_{d-2}^2$ denotes the metric of the round $d-2$ sphere $\mathbf{S}^{d-2}$. For new action-derived coordinates see [12].

In keeping with our “pre-gauge-fixing” policy, we do not employ the standard definition of the perturbation eigenvalue problem in terms the Lichnerowicz operator (reviewed below), but rather we choose a “pre-gauge-fixing” formulation as follows. For a general background X we consider $X' = X \times \mathbb{R}_z$. In our case X' is the black string. The space of zero modes of X' is defined as solutions of the linearized Einstein equations. Due to

¹The generalization to $d \neq 4$ was given in [11].

translation invariance in the z direction this space of zero modes can be diagonalized with respect to the z -translation operator. We denote these eigenvalues by ik (k is not necessarily real), and we also use $\lambda := -k^2$. The set of values of λ defines the *perturbation spectrum of X* .

For comparison, an equivalent and more standard definition is in terms of eigenvalues of the Lichnerowicz operator acting on perturbations $\delta g_{\mu\nu}$ of the space X

$$-\mathcal{D}_\rho \mathcal{D}^\rho \delta g_{\mu\nu} - 2R_\mu{}^\rho{}_\nu{}^\sigma \delta g_{\rho\sigma} = \lambda \delta g_{\mu\nu} \quad (2.2)$$

(in the notations of [1]). Where the perturbations are in the transverse traceless gauge

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^\mu \delta g_{\mu\nu} &= 0 \\ \delta g^\mu{}_\mu &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

This definition has the advantage that it does not require the auxiliary z dimension, nor in particular the auxiliary fields δg_{zz} , $\delta g_{z\mu}$. However, as we shall see, its gauge choice is restrictive and non-optimal.

Action approach and fields. Very generally in physics it is known that an action, when available, is the most concise packaging of the equations of motion, and moreover it enables the widest class of field transformations. Still in General Relativity (GR) traditionally one writes down the equations of motion, even though an action principle is known². The reason for that is the large gauge symmetry: in order for the action to encode all the equations, it must be written as a function of as many fields as there are equations, while in GR it is common practice to start by fixing the gauge (an ansatz for the metric) in order to minimize the number of fields involved and to simplify the equations.

The power of the action formalism leads us to advocate it for GR in general and specifically for the problem at hand. This strategy requires working with a maximal set of “pre-gauge-fixing” fields which is also consistent with our above-mentioned policy.

Which fields must be kept in an action approach? For a generic metric we need to keep all the metric components $g_{\mu\nu}$ in order to encode all the equations, namely all the components of the Einstein tensor $G_{\mu\nu}$. However, in the common case of *a metric with isometries* a reduction in the number of fields is possible. Given a metric which preserves the isometries, its Einstein tensor is invariant as well, and in particular some of its components necessarily vanish. Correspondingly fewer fields are required.

For the case at hand we seek perturbations of the string which preserve the $SO(d-1)_\Omega \times U(1)_t \times \mathbb{Z}_{2,t}$ isometries, namely spherical, stationary and time reflection, respectively. This “*maximally general ansatz*” is given by ³

$$ds^2 = e^{2A} dt^2 + e^{2B} dr^2 + e^{2\beta} (dz - \alpha dr)^2 + e^{2C} d\Omega_{d-2}^2 \quad (2.4)$$

²Namely, the Einstein-Hilbert action supplemented in the case of a fixed boundary by the York-Gibbons-Hawking boundary term [13, 14].

³Due to the continuous isometries the fields cannot depend on t nor on the angular coordinates, Ω . The $g_{\Omega i}$ components, where $i \neq \Omega$, must vanish since there is no spherically symmetric vector field on the sphere, while the g_{tj} must vanish for all $j \neq t$ due to time reflection combined with t -independence.

which serves to define our notation for the fields. Altogether there are 5 fields: A, B, C, α, β which are all functions of the (r, z) plane.

We note that our “maximally general ansatz” is not the same as the commonly used term “the most general ansatz”. The latter usually means that any metric can be put in that form, while our ansatz is more general than that: it is constraint-free, namely all of the Einstein equations can be obtained by varying the gravitational action with respect to its fields. Actually, if we fix the (r, z) reparameterization gauge in our ansatz and reduce the number of fields to 3, it will still be “most general”.

Computing the action. Now we shall derive the quadratic gravitational action around our black-string background without gauge fixing either the perturbations, nor the background. The result is given below in (2.12).

Before computing it, let us discuss a general property which it has. Generally, when metrics are constrained by isometries, we may *dimensionally reduce the action* by integrating it over the “isometry coordinates” and get a lower dimensional gravitational action with additional matter content. If moreover we are considering the action for perturbations around a background with isometries then we may further reduce along isometries which are broken by perturbations and get a gauged gravity action where isometry breaking perturbations are represented by charged fields. In our case the black string isometries are $U(1)_z \times SO(d-1)_\Omega \times U(1)_t \times \mathbb{Z}_{2,t}$ where $U(1)_z$ stands for z -translations and is the only isometry broken by the considered perturbations. Therefore we expect the action to be reduced over t, Ω, z resulting in a $U(1)$ gauged (from z), 1d gravity (in r) with extra matter.

We write our ansatz (2.4) as

$$ds^2 = e^{2A} dt^2 + ds_{(r,z)}^2 + e^{2C} d\Omega_{d-2}^2 . \quad (2.5)$$

By using the formulae for the Ricci scalar of a fibration (see for example appendix A in [3]) we obtain the gravitational action as

$$S = \int e^\Psi dV \left(-R_{(r,z)} + K_{ij} \partial_\mu \Phi^i \partial^\mu \Phi^j - e^{-2\hat{C}} \right) \quad (2.6)$$

where according to our sign conventions $S = -\int R$ (up to boundary terms), dV is the 2d volume element, $R_{(r,z)}$ is the 2d Ricci scalar, $\mu = r, z$ and we define

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-2\hat{C}} &:= (d-2)(d-3) e^{-2C} \\ \Psi &:= A + (d-2)C \\ \Phi^i &:= [A, C] \\ K &:= -(d-2) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & d-3 \end{bmatrix} . \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

$\hat{C}$ is a shift of C by a constant to shorten the expressions; Ψ is a useful expression which appears in $\det(g)$; A, C are scalars from the 2d point of view and K is their constant kinetic

matrix which can be written also as

$$K_{ij} \Phi^i \Phi^j = -(d-2) C (\Psi + A - C) . \quad (2.8)$$

Specifying

$$ds_{(r,z)}^2 = e^{2B} dr^2 + e^{2\beta} (dz - \alpha dr)^2 \quad (2.9)$$

we obtain

$$S = \int dr dz e^{\Psi+B+\beta} . \quad (2.10)$$

$$\left\{ K_{ij} \partial_\mu \Phi^i \partial^\mu \Phi^j - e^{-2\hat{C}} - 2 e^{-2\beta} B_z \Psi_z - 2 e^{-2B} (\beta' + \alpha_z + \alpha \beta_z) (\Psi' + \alpha \Psi_z) \right\}$$

where a prime $\equiv \partial_r$ – denotes a derivative with respect to r , and a z subscript $\equiv \partial_z$.

In our black-string background $\alpha = \beta = 0$ while $A = A_0, B = B_0, C = C_0$ are functions of r only, which depend on the choice of gauge for the background, and for instance in Schwarzschild coordinates (2.1) they are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \frac{1}{2} \log(f) \\ B_0 &= -\frac{1}{2} \log(f) \\ C_0 &= \log(r) . \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Expanding the action (2.10) to quadratic order in the perturbations we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &= \int dr dz e^{\Psi_0+B_0} \mathcal{L}_2 \\ \mathcal{L}_2 &= e^{-2B_0} \left\{ -V_0 [(\psi + \beta - b)^2 + 2(\psi + \beta - b)(b - c) + 2(b - c)^2] \right. \\ &\quad + 2K_{ij} \Phi_0^{i'} ((\psi + \beta - b) \phi^{j'} - \alpha_z \phi^j) + K_{ij} \phi^{i'} \phi^{j'} \\ &\quad - 2(\beta' + \alpha_z) (\Psi_0'(\psi + \beta - b) + \psi') + 2 \Psi_0' \alpha_z \beta \Big\} \\ &\quad + K_{ij} \phi_z^i \phi_z^j - 2\beta_z \psi_z \\ V_0 &:= e^{2(B_0-\hat{C}_0)} \end{aligned} . \quad (2.12)$$

We have used the background equation of motion $K_{ij} \Phi_0^{i'} \Phi_0^{j'} = -V_0$. The z integration above can be carried out after Fourier expanding all fields, leaving us with a 1d action as anticipated. Yet we find the current form to be more convenient.

Gauge invariance. The quadratic action (2.12) is invariant under the following gauge transformations

$$\begin{aligned} \delta a &= e^{-2B_0} A_0' \xi \\ \delta c &= e^{-2B_0} C_0' \xi \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta b &= e^{-2B_0} (-B'_0 \xi + \xi') \\
\delta \alpha &= -\hat{\xi}' - \xi_z \\
\delta \beta &= \hat{\xi}_z .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

These gauge transformations can be obtained either from the general form of an infinitesimal diffeomorphism of the background $\delta g_{\mu\nu} = D_\mu \xi_\nu + D_\nu \xi_\mu$ where $\xi_\mu dx^\mu := \xi dr + \hat{\xi} dz$ or directly by studying the symmetries of the action.⁴

How to fix the gauge? Now that the quadratic action (2.12) is available it may seem that we must fix the gauge (2.13) in order to proceed, namely to supplement the 5 (linear) equations of motion by two (linear) gauge conditions. At this point it is not clear how to do that optimally. On the other hand, the form of the action is not unique and it could still be transformed. So it makes sense to first transform, simplify and expose the action's invariant features as much as possible, namely to find a *canonical form* for it, and only later return to the issue of gauge fixing.

The action is a quadratic form whose entries are differential operators.⁵ *The set of allowed field transformations*, just like in the Gauss process for matrices, is the set of invertible transformations, generated by

$$\phi^i \rightarrow \phi^i + L\phi^j , \tag{2.14}$$

where $\phi^i, \phi^j, j \neq i$ are any two fields and L is any linear operator, possibly including derivatives. These transformations are clearly invertible and are also known as *transformations which keep the measure invariant*.⁶ In the next section we proceed to simplify the action through the use of these transformations.

3. The Power of Action

In this section we shall reap the fruit of our prudence to adopt the pre-gauge-fixing policy and the power of the action will be demonstrated: by using the invertible field transformations we will succeed to decouple parts of the action.

In the presence of a gauge symmetry the kinetic part of the action is necessarily degenerate, since due to the gauge freedom not all of the fields are determined by initial conditions. The fields which do not appear in the kinetic term are called “*non-dynamic*” fields, and they are a good place to start looking.

Decoupling the non-dynamic fields. Inspecting the quadratic action (2.12) one notices that the non-dynamic fields (with respect to r) are α, b (a vector and tensor from the r

⁴Note that here (and everywhere else) a z subscript $\equiv \partial_z$.

⁵More precisely, these are differential operators in one variable. Actually there are two variables corresponding to ∂_r and ∂_z but Fourier decomposition replaces $\partial_z \rightarrow ik$ and makes it algebraic. This problem is analogous to finding a canonical form of a quadratic form whose entries are polynomials (in a single variable).

⁶Namely, the Jacobian for the transformation of the fields is 1.

perspective), that is, they do not appear in $\mathcal{O}(\partial_r^2)$ terms. The part of the Lagrangian density which involves the non-dynamic fields is

$$\mathcal{L}_2 \supset e^{-2B_0} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_z & b \end{bmatrix} L_{ND} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_z \\ b \end{bmatrix} - 2 \begin{bmatrix} L_\alpha & L_b \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_z \\ b \end{bmatrix} \right\} \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$L_{ND} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \Psi'_0 \\ \Psi'_0 & -V_0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} L_\alpha &:= K_{ij} \Phi_0^{i'} \phi^j + \Psi'_0 \psi + \psi' \\ L_b &:= -V_0 c + K_{ij} \Phi_0^{i'} \phi^{j'} - \Psi'_0 \beta' - e^{+2B_0} \psi_{zz} \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

By shifting the α_z, b according to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{\alpha_z} \\ \widetilde{b} \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_z \\ b \end{bmatrix} - L_{ND}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} L_\alpha \\ L_b \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$L_{ND}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\Psi_0'^2} \begin{bmatrix} V_0 & \Psi'_0 \\ \Psi'_0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.5)$$

the action decouples. The non-dynamic part is simply the original non-dynamic part with $[\alpha_z, b] \rightarrow [\widetilde{\alpha_z}, \widetilde{b}]$, namely

$$\boxed{S_{ND} = \int dr dz e^{\Psi_0 - B_0} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{\alpha_z} & \widetilde{b} \end{bmatrix} L_{ND} \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{\alpha_z} \\ \widetilde{b} \end{bmatrix} \right\}} \quad (3.6)$$

and the dynamic part is supplemented by

$$\Delta \mathcal{L}_D := -e^{-2B_0} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} L_\alpha & L_b \end{bmatrix} L_{ND}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} L_\alpha \\ L_b \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.7)$$

The equations of motion for $(\widetilde{\alpha_z}, \widetilde{b})$ derived from S_{ND} (3.6) are simply

$$0 = \widetilde{\alpha_z} = \widetilde{b} . \quad (3.8)$$

Notice that the existence of an inverse for L_{ND} (3.5) was essential for this process, and this in turn depended on the fact that the non-dynamic action L_{ND} (3.3) was algebraic (while two derivative terms are forbidden by the definition of non-dynamic fields, one derivative terms are not). This process is equivalent to “*integrating out*” the *non-dynamic fields*, namely to solve their equations of motion, and substitute the solutions back into the action. Also, while our shift (3.4) involves differential operators, the action still does not contain terms with more than two derivatives due to the non-dynamic nature of the shifted fields.

Altogether we achieved a decoupling of the action into non-dynamic fields $\widetilde{\alpha}_z, \widetilde{b}$ and dynamic fields a, c, β . The quadratic action (2.12) is given now by

$$\begin{aligned}
S_2 &= S_{ND} + \int dr dz e^{\Psi_0+B_0} \mathcal{L}_D \\
\mathcal{L}_D &:= e^{-2B_0} \left\{ -V_0 [(\psi + \beta)^2 - 2c(\psi + \beta) + 2c^2] \right. \\
&\quad + 2(\psi + \beta) K_{ij} \Phi_0^i{}' \phi^{j'} + K_{ij} \phi^i{}' \phi^{j'} \\
&\quad \left. - 2\beta' (\Psi_0'(\psi + \beta) + \psi') \right\} \\
&\quad + K_{ij} \phi_z^i \phi_z^j + \Delta \mathcal{L}_D
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

We now proceed to simplify $\mathcal{L}_D$.

Gauge invariance. Performing the gauge variations (2.13) on the tilded variables (3.4) one finds that $(\widetilde{\alpha}_z, \widetilde{b})$ are *gauge invariant*. This is not surprising since once the action decouples we expect the gauge transformations to affect only one of its parts and anyway an algebraic action does not offer any symmetry that could be gauged.

The gauge symmetry reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta a &= e^{-2B_0} A_0' \xi \\
\delta c &= e^{-2B_0} C_0' \xi \\
\delta \beta &= i k \hat{\xi} .
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Since $\delta \beta \propto \hat{\xi}$ (for $0 \neq i k \equiv \partial_z$) the action (3.9) must be independent of β , as can be confirmed by direct calculation.⁷

Similarly the action can depend only on the gauge invariant combination of a, c , namely the Wronskian-like expression $C_0' a - A_0' c$. This combination is unique up to multiplication by a function of r , and inspection of the kinetic term suggests to define the dynamic gauge-invariant field to be

$$\tilde{c} := \sqrt{(d-2)(d-1)} \left(c - \frac{C_0'}{\Psi_0'} \psi \right) \tag{3.11}$$

The dynamic part of the action. In terms of the gauge invariant field $\tilde{c}$ the dynamic part of the action is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
S_D &= \int dr dz e^{\Psi_0+B_0} \left\{ e^{-2B_0} \tilde{c}'^2 + \tilde{c}_z^2 + V(r) \tilde{c}^2 \right\} = \\
&= \int dr dz e^{\Psi_0+B_0} \left\{ (\partial \tilde{c})^2 + V(r) \tilde{c}^2 \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where the “potential” is

$$V(r) := -2(d-1)(d-3) e^{-2C_0} \frac{A_0'^2}{\Psi_0'^2} . \tag{3.13}$$

⁷Gauge invariance implies that $\delta S / \delta \hat{\xi}$ is a total derivative but by (3.10) $\delta S / \delta \hat{\xi} \propto \delta S / \delta \beta$ and hence the equation of motion for β vanishes.




Figure 1: A graph of the perturbation potential V as a function of the radial coordinate r (3.15) in $r_0 = 1$ units. Drawn at $d = 4$ – in higher dimensions V becomes even more concentrated around $r/r_0 = 1$.

The equation of motion for $\tilde{c}$ is

$$-\Delta\tilde{c} + V(r)\tilde{c} = -k^2\tilde{c} \quad (3.14)$$

where $\Delta := e^{-\Psi_0 - B_0} \partial_r e^{\Psi_0 - B_0} \partial_r$ is the Laplacian in the black hole background. The analogy with a Schrödinger eigenvalue problem motivated the notation $V(r)$.

Properties of $V(r)$. The potential $V(r)$ is manifestly independent of the gauge for the background. In Schwarzschild coordinates (2.1) it is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V(r) &:= -2(d-1)(d-3) \frac{f'^2}{(2(d-2)f + r f')^2} = \\ &= -\frac{2(d-1)(d-3)^3}{r^2 \left(2(d-2)(r/r_0)^{d-3} - (d-1) \right)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

This is precisely the form given in [5] eq. (3.6). It can be seen that $V(r)$ is a negative potential concentrated strongly near the horizon: it is finite on the horizon and it vanishes asymptotically. See figure 1 for a graph of V .

3.1 Summary - the negative mode

While transforming the action we were able to completely eliminate the gauge, thereby *rendering the gauge-fixing question obsolete*. The final gauge invariant action is given by

$$S_2 = S_D[\tilde{c}] + S_{ND}[\tilde{\alpha}_z, \tilde{b}] \quad (3.16)$$

where the dynamic part is given by (3.12) and the non-dynamic part by (3.6).

The spectrum of perturbations around the black hole background is given by the eigenvalue problem (3.14) with $V(r)$ defined in (3.13). That problem has a single negative eigenvalue which defines the Gross-Perry-Yaffe eigenvalue $\lambda_{GPY} \equiv k_{GL}^2$, where k_{GL} is the Gregory-Laflamme critical wavenumber.

Our canonical form for the action (3.16) is so simple and its derivation so straightforward that it is hard to imagine a “simpler” form. It is certainly as simple as any of

the previous forms (see appendix A). It contains a single-field master equation with no singularities between the horizon and infinity, and the non-dynamic fields are determined algebraically. It turns out that our eigenvalue equation (3.14) is equivalent to the one already derived in [5]. Still the picture now is clearer: we know not to expect a simpler expression; the non-dynamic fields are algebraic, contrary to [5]; the nature of the master field is clarified to be a gauge invariant combination of the “scalars” a, c ; the potential is clarified to originate from both the sphere potential $\sim e^{-2C}$ and from the potential $\Delta\mathcal{L}_D$ (3.7) which arose during the decoupling (integrating out) of the non-dynamic fields. In addition, in the next section we will present a single field master equation for the $k = 0$ sector, which improves on the 2-field equation of [5].

4. The $k = 0$ case

The $k = 0$ zero-mode sector of perturbations around the black string background provides another example for our techniques.

Considering the quadratic action (2.12) we notice that α appears only in the combination α_z and therefore α does not participate in the $k = 0$ sector. Moreover the gauge transformation parameter $\hat{\xi}$ appears in the transformation (2.13) only as $\hat{\xi}_z$ (once one operates with ∂_z on the equation for $\delta\alpha$) and therefore neither does $\hat{\xi}$ participate in this sector.

Altogether there are 4 fields in this sector: a, b, c and β and one gauge function ξ . From our experience with $k \neq 0$ we expect that the gauge function will eliminate one field, and one will be non-dynamic leaving us with two dynamic fields. Would it be possible to decouple them?

Weyl rescaling. The answer is actually known. The $k = 0$ sector is the same as a Kaluza-Klein reduction over the z direction. In this case it is known that the $d + 1$ dimensional metric field decouples into a scalar related to g_{zz} and the d dimensional metric. The decoupling is achieved by an appropriate Weyl-rescaling. In practice we define the Weyl rescaled d -metric $\hat{g}_{\mu\nu}$ by

$$ds^2 = e^{2\gamma} \hat{ds}^2 + e^{2\beta} dz^2 \quad (4.1)$$

where the conformal factor is determined by

$$\gamma = -\frac{1}{d-2} \beta. \quad (4.2)$$

Altogether the effect on the fields is

$$\begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \\ c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{a} \\ \hat{b} \\ \hat{c} \end{bmatrix} - \frac{\beta}{d-2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.3)$$

Once we substitute the Weyl-rescaled fields (4.3) into the $k = 0$ sector of the quadratic action (2.12) β decouples. Its part in the action is

$$S_\beta = \int dr dz e^{\Psi_0 - B_0} \frac{d-1}{d-2} \beta'^2 \quad (4.4)$$

which represent a minimally coupled scalar, as expected, and from now on all fields should be understood to have $k = 0$ and all actions are restricted to this sector. Note that β is gauge invariant for $k = 0$ (2.13).

Non-dynamic action. The rest of the action contains the fields $\hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}$. Following our successful procedure we locate the non-dynamic fields and attempt to decouple them. Here $\hat{b}$ (or equivalently b) is the only non-dynamic field and the part of the action where it appears is

$$\mathcal{L}_2 \supset e^{-2B_0} \left\{ -e^{2B_0-2\hat{C}_0} \hat{b}^2 - 2L_b \hat{b} \right\} \quad (4.5)$$

where from (3.3)

$$L_b := K_{ij} \Phi_0^i \hat{\phi}^{j'} - V_0 \hat{c} . \quad (4.6)$$

The shifted b is given by

$$\tilde{b} := \hat{b} + \frac{L_b}{V_0} = \hat{b} - \hat{c} + \frac{K_{ij} \Phi_0^i \hat{\phi}^{j'}}{V_0} \quad (4.7)$$

and is gauge-invariant as before. The non-dynamic sector of the $k = 0$ action is given by

$$\boxed{S_{ND} = \int dr dz e^{\Psi_0 - B_0} \left\{ -V_0 \tilde{b}^2 \right\}} , \quad (4.8)$$

the corresponding equation of motion is

$$\tilde{b} = 0 , \quad (4.9)$$

and the added term to the dynamic action is

$$\Delta \mathcal{L}_D := +e^{-2B_0} \frac{1}{V_0} L_b^2 . \quad (4.10)$$

Eliminating the gauge and final decoupled form. We are left with the dynamic action, which is a function of $\hat{a}, \hat{c}$ and is invariant under the gauge function ξ . As for $k \neq 0$ there is a single gauge invariant combination up to multiplication by a function of r and here it is convenient to define

$$\tilde{a} := \sqrt{\frac{d-2}{d-3}} \left(\hat{a} - \frac{A'_0}{G'_0} \hat{g} \right) \quad (4.11)$$

where it is useful to define

$$G := A + (d-3)C \quad (4.12)$$

and accordingly the decomposition into background and fluctuations is $G = G_0 + g$ and Weyl-rescaling gives $g = \hat{g} - \beta$. In terms of A, G the kinetic matrix is $K_{ij} \Phi^i \Phi^j = (d-2)/(d-3) (A^2 - G^2)$. The remaining dynamic action is a function of $\tilde{a}$ alone and it reads

$$\boxed{S_{\tilde{a}} = \int dr dz e^{\Psi_0 - B_0} \frac{G_0'^2}{G_0'^2 - A_0'^2} \tilde{a}'^2} \quad (4.13)$$

where the constant prefactor in the definition of $\tilde{a}$ (4.11) was chosen as to eliminate a multiplicative constant from the action. This is an action of a scalar field with a (r dependent) non-standard Kinetic term. Note that $G_0'^2 - A_0'^2 = (d-3)/(d-2) V_0$. In Schwarzschild coordinates (2.1) this equation reads

$$S_{\tilde{a}} = \int dr dz r (r/r_0)^{d-3} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r_0}{r}\right)^{d-3}\right)^2 \tilde{a}'^2. \quad (4.14)$$

This formula was tested to reproduce the $k=0$ zero mode of the black hole which corresponds to varying r_0 .

In summary, the total gauge invariant action in the $k=0$ sector is given by

$$S_2 = S[\beta] + S[\tilde{a}] + S_{ND}[\tilde{b}] \quad (4.15)$$

where the three summands are defined by (4.4, 4.13, 4.8), respectively. Together with the decoupled form of the $k \neq 0$ sector (3.16) we have completely decoupled the quadratic action in the background of the Schwarzschild black hole.

4.1 Generalizations

Generalization. Now that we have seen the workings of this method in two cases, we may draw some general lessons. We saw that each gauge function is responsible for a non-dynamic field. The action in the non-dynamic sector is purely algebraic. The non-dynamic sector can be decoupled from the dynamic sector after a redefinition of the non-dynamical fields which renders them gauge-invariant. The remaining dynamical fields depend algebraically on the gauge functions and thus each gauge function eliminates a field, leaving a gauge-invariant dynamical action.

How general is this procedure? The essential property was that the fields depended essentially on a single variable, which was r in our case. *I claim that this method should work very generally in any essentially 1d case, including perturbations of any co-homogeneity 1 metric (or gauge field).* In particular, in the presence of n_F fields and n_G gauge functions there will be a canonical form for the action which will include an algebraic sector with n_G gauge invariant fields, and a dynamic sector with $n_F - 2n_G$ gauge invariant fields. The precise domain of validity of this statement is under study.

Short cut. Once we know that all dependence on the gauge-variant fields must vanish, we may leave behind our “pre-gauge-fixing” policy and equate those fields to zero from the outset. For example in the $k \neq 0$ case we may start by writing the action as a function of 3 fields only: α, b, c (c can be replaced by any linear combination of a, c). Then one proceeds as before to decouple α, b through redefinition. One could say therefore that the “optimal gauge” for this problem is $0 = \beta = a$ (in the sense just described – in particular $0 = \beta = c$ is as “optimal”).

Spin-offs. Let us stress some general lessons learned while solving the problem of perturbations around the Schwarzschild black hole. We saw that the power of the action formalism

does not fail when entering General Relativity. We saw that for the action to encode all equations it is important to adopt the “pre-gauge-fixing policy”, and use the “maximally general” ansatz for a given isometry group. In particular we stress the alternative formulation of the Lichnerowicz operator in terms of an extra dimension. We defined “allowed field transformation” within the action formalism to be invertible transformations, even if differential, and used them to transform the action into a “canonical form”.

Open directions. Finally I would like to mention some open directions. In this paper we worked at quadratic order but this method should certainly work beyond it. A more difficult question is whether any of these properties continues to hold for systems with more essential dimensions, such as the essentially 2d (r, θ) Kerr black hole.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Evgeny Sorkin, Vadim Asnin and Michael Smolkin for collaboration on related projects, and Ofer Aharony for a discussion.

This research is supported in part by The Israel Science Foundation grant no 607/05 and by the Binational Science Foundation BSF-2004117.

A. Previous gauges

In this section we list in chronological order some of the gauge choices which were previously used to find the negative mode.

Gross-Perry-Yaffe (1982) [1]. In $d = 4$, the transverse ($D^\mu h_{\mu\nu} = 0$) traceless⁸ ($a + b + 2c = 0$) Lichnerowicz ($\alpha = \beta = 0$) gauge was employed and a master equation was obtained (their 5.21), which in our notation reads

$$-f b'' - \frac{8r^2 - 22r_0 r + 12r_0^2}{r^2(2r - 3r_0)} b + \frac{8r_0}{r^2(2r - 3r_0)} b = \lambda b . \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Note that this equation has an unphysical singularity at $r = 3r_0/2$, the radius of the closed light-like geodesic.

Gregory-Laflamme (1993) [2]. Here not only marginally tachyonic modes were sought but also time-dependent modes $\propto e^{\Omega t}$. The Lichnerowicz gauge $\alpha = \beta = 0$ was used, and a master equation was obtained (their eq. 10) for all d . The master field is h^{tr} and since the equation is 4 lines long it is not reproduced here.

Gubser (2001) [6]. Worked in $d = 4$ with a conformal-type gauge (in the (r, z) plane)

$$ds^2 = f e^{2a} dt^2 + e^{2b} (f^{-1} dr^2 + dz^2) + r^2 e^{2c} d\Omega_2^2 . \quad (\text{A.2})$$

⁸Although in principle we are allowed only one gauge condition here (r reparameterization) tracelessness comes along with transversality.

An eigenvalue problem for 2 fields was obtained as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2r(r-1)a'' + (4r-1)a' - 2c' = 2\lambda r^2 a \\
& -r(r-1)(4r-3)c'' - (8r^2 - 16r + 9)c' - 2c + \\
& + 3(r-1)a' + 2a = \lambda(4r-3)r^2 c
\end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

in units where $r_0 = 1$.

Sorkin-Kol (2004) [7]. Generalized the Gross-Perry-Yaffe computation to arbitrary d with essentially the same gauge. The same computation was carried out in [8] only the expressions in the master equation were not simplified enough. The obtained master equation is

$$\begin{aligned}
& -f b'' + \frac{2r^2(ff'' - f'^2) - r(d-2)ff' + 2df^2}{r(rf' - 2f)} b' + \\
& + \frac{r^2 f' f'' r [2(d-1)ff'' - (d+2)f'^2] + 4ff'}{r(rf' - 2f)} b = \lambda b
\end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

Just like [1] it suffers from an unphysical singularity.

Kudoh-Miyamoto (2005) [9]. With the help of the Harmark-Obers coordinates [15] a master equation was obtained

$$-f \hat{b}'' - \frac{(d-1)f^2 - (d-3)(3d-8)f + (d-3)^2}{r(d-3 + (d-1)f)} \hat{b}' - \frac{2(d-3)^2(1-f)}{r^2(d-3 + (d-1)f)} \hat{b} = \lambda \hat{b} \tag{A.5}$$

where $\hat{b}$ is defined within the Harmark-Obers coordinates and the notation is unrelated to any previous use of $\hat{b}$. This is a single field master equation without any unphysical singularities between the horizon and infinity. However, the expressions are more complicated than our final master equation (3.14).

Sorkin-Kol (2006) [5]. Here the chosen gauge was $\alpha = 0$ together with a choice of b such that the α -constraint $\delta S / \delta \alpha = 0$ is proportional to ψ' (and there is no term without derivatives). The master field is a and the master equation is the same as the one derived here (3.14, 3.15)

$$-\frac{1}{r^{d-2}} \partial_r \left(f r^{d-2} a' \right) - \frac{2(d-1)(d-3)f'^2}{(2(d-2)f + r f')^2} a = \lambda a. \tag{A.6}$$

References

- [1] D. J. Gross, M. J. Perry and L. G. Yaffe, “Instability Of Flat Space At Finite Temperature,” Phys. Rev. D **25**, 330 (1982).
- [2] R. Gregory and R. Laflamme, “Black strings and p-branes are unstable,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2837 (1993) [arXiv:hep-th/9301052].
- [3] B. Kol, “The phase transition between caged black holes and black strings: A review,” Phys. Rept. **422**, 119 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0411240].

- [4] T. Harmark and N. A. Obers, “Phases of Kaluza-Klein black holes: A brief review,” arXiv:hep-th/0503020.
- [5] B. Kol and E. Sorkin, “LG (Landau-Ginzburg) in GL (Gregory-Laflamme),” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 4563 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0604015].
- [6] S. S. Gubser, “On non-uniform black branes,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19**, 4825 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0110193].
- [7] B. Kol and E. Sorkin, “On black-brane instability in an arbitrary dimension,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21**, 4793 (2004) [arXiv:gr-qc/0407058].
- [8] T. Prestidge, “Dynamic and thermodynamic stability and negative modes in Schwarzschild-anti-de Sitter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 084002 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9907163].
- [9] H. Kudoh and U. Miyamoto, “On non-uniform smeared black branes,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22**, 3853 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0506019].
- [10] K. Schwarzschild, “On The Gravitational Field Of A Mass Point According To Einstein’s Theory,” *Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Berlin (Math. Phys.)* **1916**, 189 (1916) [arXiv:physics/9905030].
- [11] F. R. Tangherlini, “Schwarzschild field in n dimensions and the dimensionality of space problem,” *Nuovo Cim.* **27**, 636 (1963).
- [12] B. Kol, “A New Action-Derived Form of The Black Hole Metric,” arXiv:gr-qc/0608001.
- [13] J. W. York, “Role of conformal three geometry in the dynamics of gravitation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **28**, 1082 (1972).
- [14] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, “Action Integrals And Partition Functions In Quantum Gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 2752 (1977).
- [15] T. Harmark and N. A. Obers, “Black holes on cylinders,” *JHEP* **0205**, 032 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204047].